

Appl. No. : 09/945,311
Filed : August 30, 2001

REMARKS

Claims 7-9, 25, 26, 29-32, 35, and 36 are now pending in the present application. Claims 1-3, 10-14, and 16-24 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

In response to the Office Action mailed May 23, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the above-captioned application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments.

The Applied Combination of Tzanev/Bohn Does Not Make Obvious The Motorcycle Recited By Claims 1 or 2

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Tzanev in view of Bohn. Applicant respectfully traverses the present rejection. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicant has canceled Claims 1 and 2. Thus, the present rejection is moot. Applicant expressly reserves the rights to further prosecute the original version of Claims 1 and 2 through continuation practice.

The Applied Combination of Tzanev/Saito/Bohn Does Not Make Obvious The Vehicle Recited By Claims 13, 14, 16, 20, or 21

Claims 13, 14, 16, 20, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Tzanev in view Saito et al. and in further view of Bohn. Applicant respectfully traverses the present rejection. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicant has canceled Claims 13, 14, 16, 20, and 21 without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, the present rejection is now moot. Applicant expressly reserves the rights to further prosecute the original version of Claims 13, 14, 16, 20, and 21 through continuation practice.

The Applied Combination of Tzanev/Saito et al./Bohn/Sasaki Does Not Make Obvious The Method Recited By Claim 17

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Tzanev in view of Saito et al., further in view of Bohn, and further in view of Sasaki. Applicant respectfully traverses the present rejection. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicant has canceled Claim 17 without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, the present rejection is now moot. Applicant expressly reserves the rights to further prosecute the original version of Claim 17 through continuation practice.

Appl. No. : 09/945,311
Filed : August 30, 2001

The Applied Combination of Tzanev/Saito et al./Bohn/Carson et al. Does Not Make Obvious The Method Recited By Claims 18 and 19

Claims 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Tzanev in view of Saito et al., further in view of Bohn, and further in view of Carson et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the present rejection. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicant has canceled Claims 18 and 19 without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, the present rejection is now moot. Applicant expressly reserves the rights to further prosecute the original version of Claims 18 and 19 through continuation practice.

The Applied Combination of Tzanev/Saito et al./Bohn/Schiffmann Does Not Make Obvious The Method Recited By Claims 22-24

Claims 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Tzanev in view of Saito et al., further in view of Bohn, and further in view of Schiffmann. Applicant respectfully traverses the present rejection. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicant has canceled Claims 22-24 without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, the present rejection is now moot. Applicant expressly reserves the rights to further prosecute the original version of Claims 22-24 through continuation practice.

Appl. No. : 09/945,311
Filed : August 30, 2001

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. Accordingly, early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is most earnestly solicited.

The undersigned has made a good faith effort to respond to all of the rejections in the case and to place the claims in condition for immediate allowance. Nevertheless, if any undeveloped issues remain or if any issues require clarification, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicant's attorney, Michael A. Guiliana at (949) 721-6384 (direct line), in order to resolve such issue promptly.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: April 24, 2006

By:  _____

Michael A. Guiliana
Registration No. 42,611
Attorney of Record
2040 Main Street
Fourteenth Floor
Irvine, CA 92614
(949) 760-0404

2544683
042106